Land policy REVIEW

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Contents FOR FEBRUARY 1942 *Vol.* V *No.* 2

		Page
Release the Brakes	*Rainer Schickele*	3
Using Rural Manpower	*Glen T. Barton*	11
Defense Housing	*Ruth H. Schill*	14
Order in Drainage Programs	*Fred A. Clarenbach*	19
Gardening with Discretion	*H. W. Hochbaum*	23
Priorities in Machines	*Erling Hole*	27
Repairing Farm Machines	*C. H. Bernhard*	32
Apples and Planning	*Edwin F. Landerholm*	35
Books	*Caroline Boyer, Gerhard J. Isaac, Constance E. H. Daniel*	38

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Editorial Notes

CONTRIBUTORS: H. W. Hochbaum is chief of the division of field coordination, Extension Service, and chairman of the garden committee of the Department of Agriculture.

Ruth H. Schill has worked for Farm Security Administration since 1935, in Nebraska and Washington.

C. H. Bernhard taught in Syracuse University before joining the Northeastern regional staff of AAA in April. Erling Hole does research in interregional competition in the BAE division of farm management and costs.

Glen T. Barton is an agricultural economist in the BAE division of farm population and rural welfare.

Rainer Schickele, one of the first contributors to Land Policy Review, is an agricultural economist and cooperative employe of Iowa State College, the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station, and BAE.

Fred A. Clarenbach, an agricultural economist, works in the section of the BAE division of land economics.

Edwin F. Landerholm is the BAE State representative in Washington.

Constance E. H. Daniel is senior administrative assistant in Farm Security Administration. Caroline Boyer works in the textile division of the Bureau of Home Economics. Gerhard J. Isaac is a member of the division of agricultural finance, BAE.

Our goal for the post-war years must be to join as free men, each of us in all lines of production, to turn out enough of everything even at the risk of turning out a little too much. So long as there are hungry people and people needing the necessities of life in this country of ours, there is no such thing as too much in industry or agriculture.

—Claude R. Wickard

LAND • POLICY • REVIEW

Land Policy Review is published monthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, with approval of the Bureau of the Budget. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 5 cents a single copy, 50 cents a year

Release the Brakes ON FARM PRODUCTION!

By RAINER SCHICKELE. *We don't doubt for a minute our ability to meet new production goals—but there are problems of tenure that might stand in the way if unsolved or, if cleared away, could leave the agricultural plants in a better position than ever before.*

AGRICULTURAL production is being thrown into high gear. Industrial output, too, is swelling rapidly. Unemployment is dwindling, and behind the rising prices may lurk inflation.

How is this upsurge of economic activities throughout the Nation affecting the tenure conditions of the people living on the land? How are present tenure conditions likely to affect the efforts and accomplishments of the agricultural defense program? What repercussions are the defense efforts and post-war adjustments likely to have upon the tenure relations under which farmers occupy the land? Many people are asking these questions. If we can find answers to them, we shall be doing much for the whole agricultural program, in war and peace.

In industry, an increase in output within 1 year is rather easily achieved. Labor and raw materials can be concentrated in those production lines, plants can be operated in two or three shifts, and the rate of output can be controlled within wide ranges and short periods of time.

Not so in agriculture. It takes a cow 285 days to produce a calf regardless of any national emergency; the most ruthless dictatorships have not been able to change the seasons or coerce the weather; and land cannot be moved around to where it is most needed. This means that an all-out effort to increase rapidly the

output of some major farm products (especially livestock and certain fruits) requires the simultaneous efforts of most farmers producing these particular goods.

We need significantly larger production of only two annual crops—soybeans and peanuts. Their acreages can be readily expanded on owner as well as tenant farms. All other major production increases involve livestock enterprises—hogs, beef, dairy, and poultry.

But prevailing tenancy conditions discourage the production of these goods. The Midwest produces the bulk of hog, beef, dairy, and poultry products, and in these States tenants operate a large proportion of farms under 1-year leases. Many studies have shown that the intensity of livestock production is considerably lower on tenant than on owner farms. In a typical Midwestern community it was found that owners had 50 percent more animal units per 100 acres of farm land than had the tenants. The effect of tenancy upon livestock production is especially pronounced in roughage-consuming animals, beef and dairy cattle, and sheep, since they require pasture and hay which are discouraged by the common crop-share-cash leases.

If tenants can be induced to respond like owners to certain general production incentives, the rate of output increase in livestock enterprises undoubtedly will be markedly higher. This would be particularly useful, since the physical limits to quick expansion in beef and dairy production, and to a smaller degree in hogs and poultry, are narrow. Consequently, if one group of farmers lags behind, the other group cannot compensate for such a lag by expanding correspondingly more and faster; the result is a rate of increase substantially smaller than if tenants responded like owners.

A Brake

Four factors which are largely responsible for lower livestock production among tenants are: Insecurity of occupancy, lack of improvements, lack of production credit, and certain peculiarities of rental arrangements.

Most leases run from year to year and expire automatically unless they are explicitly renewed. Renters may have stayed on the same farm for 10 years, but without ever knowing before late fall or winter whether they could stay for the next season. Efficient livestock enterprises require planning several years ahead; the insecure tenant cannot make the necessary long-time plans, but must concentrate on annual cash crops that can readily be marketed at the end of the lease year.

The development of livestock enterprises entails semipermanent and permanent improvements, among them the application of lime and phosphates, fences, sheds and barns, water tanks, stanchions, and storage space for hay in the barn. Many landlords are not inclined to furnish these improvements adequately because insecure tenants have little use for them. On the other hand, tenants themselves are not inclined to make such improvements, which are fixed, and become the property of the landlord by virtue of being affixed to the land, and outside tenants would bid up the rent. Unless there is fairly strong cooperation between landlord and tenant, the latter may even jeopardize his occupancy by improving the farm.

Rapid expansion in livestock production requires more and different types of credit than in crop production. Concentrates, feed grains, sires, and heifers cannot be bought on installments like crop machinery. The creditor's risk in accepting chattel mortgages on cattle, hogs, or crops is high. Before crops can be offered as collateral, the landlord's waiver of his lien may be required. In some States, like Iowa, the landlord's lien covers even all the tenant's livestock and equipment. Hence, often the tenant's main source of credit is "character loans"—and they often are undependable and expensive.

Finally, the crop-share type of lease prevailing in the Midwest puts a premium on cash crops at the expense of hay and pasture and livestock. The landlord's share of the crop is usually sold off the farm, and only about half of the feed grain is available for the tenant's livestock. The cash rental rate on pasture and hayland is determined probably more by the size and condition of the buildings and the competition of tenants for the whole farm than by the productivity of the grassland and what the roughage is worth to the tenant. This rental procedure keeps grass acreage down and reduces livestock production on tenant-operated land.

Releasing the Brake

These four groups of factors militate against the expansion of livestock production on rented farms, most effectively against beef and dairy cattle, least against hogs. Is it possible to release these brakes on output expansion quickly, within the next few years?

Making owners out of tenants is necessarily a long-run policy that cannot be counted upon for quick results. The main remedy, then, lies in adjustments of landlord-tenant relations.

The security of the tenant's occupancy can be increased by various means. The most obvious is leases running 3 to 5 years. There are not many such leases in the Midwest. Landlords—even some tenants—are reluctant to commit themselves for several years ahead—particularly in times of uncertain prices. But two supplementary provisions can make long leases more feasible: Compensation for disturbance if either party chooses to cancel the lease before its expiration, and adjustment in the cash part of the rent if violent price changes or severe crop failures occur.

The tenant's security can be increased even under 1-year leases by an automatic continuation clause providing for an early date of notification in case the lease is to terminate at the end of the lease year. Six months' notice seems to be fairly adequate for most of the Midwest. This device lends itself to legislative enactment by the States, and, therefore, can be made effective more quickly and universally than if one were to depend solely upon the slow process of education. Iowa enacted such a law in 1939, providing for the automatic continuance of all farm leases and requiring 4 months' notice for termination.

The lack of improvements on rented farms can be remedied by granting the tenant compensation for unexhausted improvements and the right to remove fixtures he has supplied. That would enable the tenant to apply limestone and phosphates, seed alfalfa, improve and expand pastures, put up poultry and

hog houses and stanchions, fences, water tanks, and the like at his own expense without fear of losing the benefits if the landlord asked him to quit.

Reinvestment

A fairly general acceptance of the improvement compensation principle is bound to release considerable productive capacity in tenant farming, particularly in the next few years, when tenants' incomes will increase. An opportunity to reinvest part of that increase in the farm will stimulate production and partly offset the tenant's handicap of obtaining credit. Educational promotion of this principle can be implemented by legislation, since it clearly lies within the jurisdiction of State legislatures to protect the tenant's equity in improvements he has made.

The main sources of production credit are local commercial banks, Production Credit Associations, and the FSA. It is generally recognized that the Food for Freedom Program requires more short-term credit for farmers. Since the Federal Reserve System has about $4,000,000,000 in excess reserves, the supply of loanable funds appears ample; our concern is whether tenants have equal access to these credit funds with farm owners.

Observers agree that, by and large, it is easier for owner-operators than for tenants to obtain adequate production credit at comparable rates. Most of the Midwestern clients of the FSA rehabilitation loan program are tenants; and the greater part of their loans are used in livestock production in most areas, and it is certain that the FSA loan program takes on increasing significance in the Food for Freedom Program.

The tenant's demand for production credit can be expected generally to increase with any increase in his security and protection of his equity in improvements. The remedy of the lack of credit on tenant farms, therefore, rests in part upon the success in making the tenant's occupancy more secure and in compensating him for investment in improvements in case he moves off the farm.

The crop-share lease is used on two-thirds to three-fourths of all rented farms in the Midwest, and will continue to be the major lease type during the next few years. Its depressing effect upon livestock production could be reduced by relatively lower cash rent rates on hay and pasture land and by sale of the landlord's crop share to the tenant. General encouragement of the crop-share tenant to keep as much livestock on the farm as he can would be as much to the landlord's interest in soil maintenance as to the Nation's interest in expanded production.

War and Tenancy

Now we come to the second group of problems: How is the victory program likely to affect tenure conditions?

We can expect that the tenant's security of occupancy will be increased as a result of higher farm prices and greater industrial employment. With the better prices, fewer tenants will default in rent payments, fewer landlords will be disappointed with their rent returns, and there will be less cause for friction between them. Furthermore, better urban employment opportunities will tend to reduce the competition for farms; this might cause

landlords to offer their tenants greater security and to refrain from driving rents up to the limits.

There are some indications that tenant mobility is declining. In Iowa, only 12 percent of all tenants were on the move in the spring of 1941, compared to 14 percent in 1940 and 20 percent in 1935. Similar tendencies are reported elsewhere in the Midwest. This decrease, nevertheless, does not mean that tenants actually have greater security now to carry on longer-term production operations. Merely staying on the farm several years does not permit necessarily the substitution of livestock enterprises for cash-crop enterprises.

We can expect that cash rents for the next year or two will lag behind farm prices, and result in larger incomes for tenants. In a survey conducted in Iowa a year ago, the average level of cash rent per acre increased by less than 1 percent from 1940 to 1941, while farm prices increased about 30 percent. Even if 1942 farm prices should not rise much above the 1941 level, the increase in 1942 cash rents is not likely to exceed 30 percent. A strong lag in cash rents occurred during the first World War, when rents in Iowa from 1915 to 1919 increased 34 percent, as farm prices climbed 120 percent. The lag might not be so pronounced in the present period, because farm prices may not go up so much, and landlords generally are probably in a somewhat stronger bargaining position than in 1915–19.

The net effect of the lag and the increase of the tenant's income upon output is apt to be favorable, by partly offsetting the credit handicap under which tenants operate. It will depend upon what proportion of the income increase will be used for paying off debts, purchasing consumption goods and services, accumulating savings (including the purchase of land), and reinvesting in the farm enterprise. It is the latter only which leads to expansion of output.

In the post-war period, we can expect that cash rents will lag behind the decline of farm prices and income, as they have done in the last post-war period. Many county agricultural planning committees in Iowa have recommended that leases should contain a clause providing for deferment of cash rent payments in case of drought or depression.

Effects on Ownership

Some tenants are going to use their increased incomes to buy farms. In the spring of 1941, about 2.4 percent of all tenants in Iowa moved to farms they had bought, usually with a very low down payment. Whether this rate of climbing the ladder to the ownership rung will increase during the next few years will largely depend upon the movement of land prices, the additional increases in tenant incomes, the availability of easy credit terms, the volume of institutional land holdings, and the extent to which city investors will appear on the land market. The duration of the war and the post-war conditions will greatly influence the ultimate changes in farm ownership.

At the end of the war period, many owners may be caught in the pincer of high fixed debt charges and reduced cash incomes. It would help agriculture and the Nation if effective measures were adopted to prevent wholesale foreclosures after the war by providing for definite procedures of deferment of debt pay-

ments under certain conditions of default.

Such provisions, particularly if adopted during the war period, would caution creditors against lending at unduly easy terms, would dampen the rise in land values, and would minimize the wasteful dislocations in the tenure situation associated with depressions. Rural opinion overwhelmingly favors protecting the owner-operator's equity in his farm and his home against severe price declines. This protection should also be extended to contract purchasers whose position is even more vulnerable than that of an encumbered owner.

The Iowa State Committee on Agricultural Programs has strongly recommended the adoption of such measures. The committee, in a report in November 1941 said:

"Plans for deferring payments of interest and principal in times of drought or low prices should be adopted. Variable payment plans for purchase of farm real estate should be encouraged. Six months' notice should be required to terminate a contract purchase. Contract purchasers should be protected by a clause providing for compensation for unexhausted improvements which may have been made, in case the contract is terminated."

Furthermore, it urged immediate and serious consideration of measures designed to promote and protect owner-operatorship of family-sized farms, such as "a graduated land tax, forcing sale of farms held by credit agencies, a land transfer tax favoring owner-operators, discouragement of farm consolidation by limiting size of AAA or corn-sealing payments one man might secure * * * and devices to limit speculative buying of land."

Finally, let us turn to a question that looms large in the minds of farmers everywhere: How will the family farm emerge from the war period?

There is much anxiety over the relentless drift toward larger and larger farms, over "land-hogs" grabbing up farms right and left, and operating them as large units with tractors and hired hands. Scores of owners and tenants are said to be squeezed out of farming and rendered homeless and jobless by a few large operators with ample capital and superior bargaining power. The family farm is held to be the foundation for a healthy rural community, and a sturdy democracy by most rural people. This type appears to be waning in some areas under the onslaught of industrialization with its absentee ownership, poverty, and insecurity of the people on the land, and concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few. Will war and post-war events accelerate or retard this trend?

Nobody knows the answer. But if people want to protect and strengthen the family farm, they must look out for the factors endangering it, and must plan concerted action for its defense.

During the next few years, the relative scarcity of hired laborers and agricultural machinery will tend to discourage the establishment of many new large farm enterprises. Furthermore, the emphasis of the Food for Freedom Program falls upon livestock production, and the family farm is superior, or at least equal, to the large-scale farm in the efficiency of livestock production. The biological character, particularly of hog,

beef, and dairy enterprises, is not conducive to large-scale mechanization and dependence upon hired labor. On the other hand, this very scarcity of machinery and labor might make it easier for some family farms to increase their acreage at the expense of others, and thereby facilitate a fuller utilization of existing machinery and labor.

Balance

From the short-time viewpoint, this form of farm consolidation within the frame-work of family farms need not be undesirable. In fact, particularly if such consolidation absorbs previously under-sized units on the poorer lands, and if the displaced farm families find better opportunities in industry, it results in a better balance of labor with land and capital and in better farm living conditions.

In the long run, however, such consolidations may prove to become an opening wedge for large-scale farming, when during the post-war years labor flows back to the land, and the supply of tractors and machinery swells as a result of shifting from armaments to peacetime production. Even if we take a most optimistic view regarding our success in keeping unemployment at a minimum and consumer purchasing power at a maximum, through courageous fiscal policies and efficient planning of the redirection of our labor and capital resources, a considerable slackening of employment and drop in prices seems inevitable. It is conceivable that under such circumstances many of the smaller owner-operators with mortgages or purchase contracts will be dispossessed, and their land absorbed by the larger operators who can draw upon an ample supply of cheap farm labor.

In general, however, the position of the family farm is, and will continue to be, relatively strong in the Corn and Dairy Belts.

There, the problem is rather to prevent a few aggressive and financially strong operators from cornering the land and rent market at the expense of the many financially weaker operators. The present inequality in the distribution of the land resources among farm families is already much greater than is warranted from the viewpoint of the general welfare, and decisive policies should be directed toward greater equalization of the land shares, accounting, of course, for differences in land productivity and market location.

Family Farms

The prospects of the family farm are much dimmer in the regions of specialty crops like vegetables, fruits, and sugar, and in the Cotton Belt. A reduction in the supply of seasonal and migrant labor, unionization, and higher wages would discourage

Must

The world today is strewn with the wrecks of democracies which tried to find their security in the past. We must find ours in the future.

—R. M. EVANS

large-scale farming in specialty crops and encourage their diffusion into more diversified family farms. This would necessitate the development of marketing facilities through which large numbers of small-scale producers could market their vegetables and fruits. The coincidence of a shortage in seasonal farm labor and of a need for a substantial expansion of these protective food crops would justify the adoption of policies to stimulate production on large numbers of family farms. Such policies would almost necessarily involve improvement of the tenant's security of occupancy and more adequate credit facilities for tenants, particularly in the South.

A prerequisite for strengthening the family farm in the Cotton Belt is a decisive graduation of sharecroppers to the status of full-fledged tenants and owners, with security of occupancy, increasing managerial freedom and responsibilities, and their deliverance from the "furnish system."

Strong educational support and guidance is an essential part of this graduation process. Neither the defense boom nor the post-war period appears to offer any specific hopes for developments in that direction. All the more necessary is it to rally all possible forces that can contribute to the emancipation of the sharecropper, in order to raise living conditions, civil rights, and human dignity more nearly to acceptable standards. The problems of tenure, farm size, and land use adjustments in the Cotton Belt are complex, indeed, but who would seriously argue that because a bad situation is complex, it cannot be improved?

Times of national emergency offer the greatest scope to statesmanship and the greatest challenge to the courage and ingenuity of leaders and of the people to whom they are responsible.

In times of emergency, obsolete habits and institutions crack, attitudes are in flux, new patterns of relationships and conduct emerge. It is in such times that people demand social vision and resolute action from the leaders they have chosen.

Too often do these leaders fail to sense the temper of their people, to realize their willingness, nay eagerness, to support progressive actions. How can people have confidence in leaders who keep sitting on fences, waiting to be prodded and nudged? There is latent in the American people an overwhelming consensus on the fundamental character of democracy, on the meaning of general welfare, and equality of opportunity. They want their leaders to articulate these latent desires and translate them into action.

The plight of pauperized owners, insecure tenants, undernourished and disfranchised sharecroppers and farm laborers is ample testimony to the inadequacy of our tenure institutions. The people on the land rightly suspect the ephemeral blessings of the war boom to turn into curses in the post-war aftermath.

The war effort on the home front consists in improving the foundations of our democratic way of life; to agriculture, that means a tenure system that facilitates a more equal distribution of land among farmers, a more secure possession of the improved homestead, a more equal opportunity to develop and exercise managerial initiative and skill, and a more equal chance to get rooted in a community as a respected citizen and neighbor.

Rural Manpower
AND TOTAL WAR

By GLEN T. BARTON. *Full mobilization and use of all labor and resources will be needed to meet war-production goals during the next 2 years. What are these production goals of total war? What part does rural manpower play in our effort to achieve them? What changes are in prospect for agricultural labor in the war years?*

WE MUST fully mobilize and utilize all labor and resources to meet war-production goals during the next 2 years. What part does rural manpower play in our effort to achieve them? What changes are in prospect for agricultural labor in the war years ahead?

Our President challenged the Nation with armament-production goals that are almost beyond comprehension: 60,000 planes in 1942, and in 1943, 125,000; 45,000 tanks this year, 75,000 next; 8,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant ships in 1942, almost 8 times the 1941 production; and antiaircraft guns, warships, and other implements of war on a comparable scale. Total war may mean an armed force of five, six, or seven million men. Our war budget for the fiscal year is $56,000,000,000—more than half of the estimated national income.

Agricultural production goals in 1942 call for the greatest farm output in our Nation's history. Not only must we produce for our own needs, but to a significant extent for some or all of the other 25 United Nations.

Attainment of all these objectives requires manpower in ever increasing numbers. Although we have only begun to get under way on our over-all program, the impending scarcity of labor is already apparent. Total nonagricultural employment is at record levels—more than 40,500,000 in November 1941, compared to 35,000,000 in June 1940. Slightly more than 2,000,000 men were in the armed forces last November. Approximately 10,000,000 persons were engaged in agriculture, even though November is a relatively slack season for farming in most areas. Total unemployment had sunk 4,500,000 from the level of 8,500,000 a year and a half earlier.

The 4,000,000 unemployed included more than 1,000,000 WPA workers, of whom 30 percent were on projects directly related to defense. But all this is the picture for November—before Pearl Harbor; defense and not war.

Fulfillment of our reconstituted total goals will bring further changes. Expansion of war-indus-

try production, even allowing for the shift of production from civilian goods, will probably result in a further increase of 2,000,000 nonagricultural workers before the end of the year. Millions will be added to our armed forces. The already large migration of workers from our rural areas will be accelerated. More and more people will have to be drawn into our labor force from those who now are neither working nor seeking work. This latter group will and must include millions of women. If our total war effort is to be achieved every possible person must be set to work and every effort made to utilize efficiently the capacity of each worker.

The Underemployed

What does all this mean for agriculture? As the President has pointed out, no food shortage is in prospect at present. Our immediate national need is for the implements of war and for the men to use them. Agriculture has and will continue to contribute manpower for the factories and the armed forces. But adequate food supplies must be maintained and increased needs met. Thus, agriculture should use its manpower in two ways in the all-out effort: Contribute workers needed in the factories and in the armed forces, and utilize with all possible efficiency the manpower remaining at its disposal so that agricultural production goals can be achieved.

How can agriculture perform this twofold function with respect to its manpower? To begin with, agriculture can contribute hundreds of thousands of underemployed workers from rural areas that have contributed relatively little to commercial farm production.

Poor families depending entirely upon farming in areas of population pressure and poor resources could give up most of their workers to the factories or the armed forces with a negligible effect upon total agricultural production. A similar contribution can be made by poor farm families in areas where a reduction in the number of farms would result in more efficient commercial production on relatively fertile lands.

The movement of workers from these areas will improve their economic status, and would more effectively utilize their labor in our total productive effort.

Still other underemployed farm workers can be spared. A substantial number of year-round family workers on commercial farms can be dispensed with through more efficient organization and more intensive utilization of the remaining workers. Still more underutilized rural manpower exists because of the inherent seasonality of agricultural labor demands. The increase in farm employment from the low month of January to the peak in July is in excess of 3,000,000 workers. At least one-half of this increase represents seasonal employment of high-school children.

Rural women also form part of the seasonal increase in employment. The remaining seasonal workers are of crucial importance to agricultural production for not more than 1 or 2 months in the year. Utilization of the other 10 or 11 months of labor power of these workers could contribute materially to the total productive effort.

There is still another large reservoir of manpower in all rural areas: Men and women not now in the labor force—neither working nor

seeking work, but potential workers for both agriculture and industry. If the total war effort is to be prosecuted successfully, many workers will have to come from this source.

Conceivable demands for manpower by war industry and the armed forces can easily result in a net migration of more than 2,000,000 workers from rural areas during the next 2 years—a reduction of almost 20 percent of the number reported as engaged in agriculture in the peak month of 1941. Agriculture can contribute this manpower from the sources suggested above and still meet its own production goals.

Attaining Goals

What steps may be necessary to insure the attainment of agricultural production goals with a greatly reduced labor force? Quite obviously, "farming as usual," particularly with respect to the use of labor, cannot continue. The remaining farm operators — who normally constitute over half of the agricultural labor force—must work harder and more effectively than ever before. The same applies to members of their families.

Farm machinery must be fully utilized, both by the individual farmer and on a cooperative or custom work basis. Full use of available regular hired farm workers will be called for in every farming community. Wages, housing facilities, and working conditions must be made sufficiently attractive to insure the retention on farms of key hired men.

Seasonal hired farm workers constitute a special problem. While they normally represent about one-fourth of total agricultural workers during the harvest season, most of them are employed on the relatively few farms which produce labor-intensive crops such as vegetables.

Here serious problems are in prospect. Farmers must be prepared not only to exert the utmost effort on their own part, but also to place increasing reliance on the employment of women and children at times of peak labor demand. Programs whereby local nonagricultural workers are utilized for farm work for short periods during harvest seasons will undoubtedly be needed in many areas.

A large part of the farm labor problem can be most successfully met by cooperative action on the part of the farmers themselves. Full use of the Farm Placement Service and other State and Federal agencies will further insure that available farm workers will be effectively used.

Our total war production goals can be met. Sufficient manpower can be "drafted," voluntarily, or literally if need be, to insure that labor will not be a bottleneck in the accomplishment of our over-all objectives.

The task for agriculture in the war years ahead is by no means easy. But produce, it can and must. Production goals must not be lowered because of a prospective shortage of labor. Rather, faith should be held that through cooperative efforts of the farmers themselves, and assistance of Federal and State programs, the work will be done. Herein lies a major job for farmers working cooperatively through their agricultural planning committees.

Good Emergency Houses, NOT GHOST TOWNS

By RUTH H. SCHILL. *More than 525,000 new houses will be needed in defense areas; it is estimated that at least 125,000 of them will have to be built by the Government. Farm Security Administration is meeting this challenge.*

WAR INDUSTRIES are booming. Explosives plants, ordnance depots, machine-tool industries, air bases, bag-loading plants—all are teeming with activity. Thousands upon thousands of workers have been drawn from other industries and from farm areas to turn out war equipment. Factories have doubled and tripled their pay rolls. Cities already overpopulated are bursting with families looking for homes. Crossroads communities suddenly need hundreds of homes to take care of the influx of population. At some plants, labor turn-over is as high as 500 percent because workers cannot find homes or cannot pay exorbitant rents.

Providing homes for the men behind the men behind the guns is a prime problem of war production. Morale and adequate war housing go hand in hand.

The Coordinator of Defense Housing estimated last summer that of the 525,000 new homes needed in defense areas this year, at least 125,000 would have to be built by the Government.

The Lanham Defense Housing Act of October 14, 1940, provided for the appropriation of $150,000,000 to initiate a program of public housing for workers in defense industries. This legislation was followed by two Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bills providing funds for temporary defense housing which would avoid the construction of future "ghost towns" and would provide "stop-gap" housing while permanent homes were under construction. An act providing supplemental appropriations for national defense, including a $300,000,000 item for defense housing, was approved December 17, 1941.

The Division of Defense Housing Coordination reports that, as of December 20, 1941, construction agencies had been allocated projects providing a total of 148,950 housing units. Of this number, 129,154 were regular family dwelling units, 8,745 were trailers and portable houses, and 11,051 were single dormitory units. A total of 71,359 had been completed, 62,444 of which were family dwellings, 2,237 trailers, and 6,678 dormitories.

The Farm Security Administration, because of its experience in the construction of more than 20,000 low-cost homes under its resettle-

ment and tenant-purchase programs, became one of the construction agencies for permanent defense housing.

From the Lanham Act appropriation, FSA has been allocated $5,710,878 to provide permanent defense homes at four projects: 200 family units in one locality and 150 units in another in Virginia; 1,000 in Maryland, and 72 in California.

At the end of December the two undertakings in Virginia were practically complete, construction work was under way in California, and 152 units were ready for occupancy at the Maryland project, with 144 units nearing completion and 704 under construction.

As a part of its program to provide at least a minimum of shelter and sanitary facilities for migrant agricultural workers, FSA had explored the possibilities of mobile housing. Sixteen mobile camps providing accommodations for 3,200 families at one time had been built and managed by the agency. Because of this experience, FSA, on the recommendation of the Defense Housing Coordinator, was designated by the President as an agency to provide temporary defense housing.

Temporary Homes

The major part of FSA's war housing program consists of providing temporary facilities. These are of three types—trailers, dormitories, and demountable houses. As of December 15, FSA had received allocations totaling $20,000,000 for temporary housing. Projects had been approved for approximately 16,500 units, 6,500 of which are available for occupancy. Nearly half the facilities are trailers or houses for family occupancy and half are single dormitory units. From the new $300,000,000 appropriation, $13,000,000 has been allocated to the Farm Security Administration for 10,867 additional temporary housing units, 5,200 of which will be dormitory accommodations and 5,667 of which will be trailers.

The Office of Defense Housing Coordination determines the need for housing, the number and type of units to be supplied, and then recommends the agency to carry out the program. After a formal request from that office, FSA submits cost estimates for the facilities specified. The President, upon the recommendation of the Coordinator of Defense Housing, approves an allocation of funds for the proposed developments, and FSA then assumes responsibility for the construction and operation of the housing facilities.

As soon as FSA receives an allocation, it sends representatives from its regional office to the locality to select a site. The availability of water, sewerage mains, electric current, and good drainage are of primary importance in choosing the location. Most of the sites are leased. In a few instances, where rental rates were prohibitive and where the land will be of value to the Government in the future, sites have been purchased.

As soon as site arrangements are made, FSA's engineers go to work on a project plan, laying out the locations of water and sewerage mains, the placement of trailers, houses or dormitories, and the location of sanitary and utility buildings.

Next, plans and specifications are made available to bidders and bids are awarded to private contractors in

accordance with Government procedure.

Trailer Cities

Under the new program, trailer cities have sprung up over the country from Maine to California. This stopgap housing is used to give complete mobility. As the national housing program got under way, it soon became evident that there was too great a lag between the time housing was needed and the time units were ready for occupancy. To fill the breach, the trailer program was devised. When permanent houses are built, trailers are moved to another locality where there is a housing shortage. In many instances trailers are used in areas where no long-term demand for housing is expected, but where the short-term need for dwellings—usually for construction workers—is acute.

Trailer camps are usually ready to be lived in within 60 days after an allocation is made. Where utilities are available, the time may be much shorter. At Waterloo, N. Y., where 90 trailers were moved from Erie, Pa., trailers were set up on the fairgrounds, connected up with water and sewerage mains already installed, and were ready for occupancy in 3 days.

There are two types of trailers—standard and expansible. The former house four persons; expansibles accommodate six and comprise about 20 percent of each trailer camp.

Standard trailers, specially built and wider than the trailers commonly seen along highways, are 8 by 22 feet. A lot 25 by 40 feet is provided for each trailer. Each unit is equipped with a gasoline stove, refrigerator, 10-gallon water tank, wardrobe lockers, and two studio couches which can be opened to make double beds. The trailers, of plywood and pressed board, with painted canvas roofs and one inch of insulation, cost approximately $945, and rent for $6 to $7 a week.

Expansible trailers provide 2,569 cubic feet of living space, as much as a small house. They are made of masonite and are insulated. The trailers have two wings folded against the sides. When the trailer is expanded, the wings unfold from the central part, end walls swing out, the side moves outward, and a hinged roof and floor are unfolded into place. The wing, when locked into position, is suspended at each end from the top of the fixed central section by airplane cables, and jacks at each corner afford additional support. Eight windows insure a bright and airy interior. Floors are covered with linoleum. Doors lead from the central section and from each wing. Ample closet space is provided. The kitchen occupies only half of the main hallway of the trailer and does not interfere with the living space in the wings. The average cost of expansible trailers is $1,600.

FSA has so far encountered no difficulty in obtaining trailers. Deliveries usually begin about 5 days after the contractor is given notice to proceed with orders.

Although trailers have wastewater buckets, sanitary facilities are located in central utility buildings or trailers. In camps where utility buildings are erected, each building serves approximately 120 trailers. Buildings contain toilets, showers, lavatories, and laundry tubs. The structures are demountable, so that

they can be moved when the camp is no longer needed.

Semimobile utility buildings have been used on some projects. These consist of cubicles or cells, 8 by 16 feet, built in the form of outbuildings on skids. The cell can be lifted bodily onto a truck and transported intact. Plumbing fixtures need only to be connected to the underground mains on the site.

Some of the most recently constructed trailer camps are completely mobile, having trailers containing showers, toilet, and laundry facilities. Expansible trailers are used for this purpose, with lavatories in the wings of the shower trailers, and ironing boards in the wings of the laundry units. Each utility trailer serves about 60 trailer families. Laundry trailers cost $4,610, including two washing machines, and combination shower, and toilet trailers cost $4,819.

The initial cost of utility trailers is slightly higher than the cost of demountable utility buildings, but if many moves are necessary the mobile units are more economical because of the cost involved in dismantling, moving, and reassembling the buildings.

Gravel roads and sidewalks are built for each trailer camp.

Portable Houses

Portable houses are of two kinds—single and duplex. Both are prefabricated, with floors, sides, and roofs made in panels and bolted together. Built on wooden piers, the houses are made of plywood or wood siding with ¾ inch of insulation board. Pitched roofs are covered with 90-pound mineral-surfaced roofing paper, which lasts 11 years.

Each unit in a duplex has a living room 12 by 14 feet, a bedroom 8½ by 12 feet, a bathroom, clothes closet, and a sink and tray cabinet. Plenty of light is afforded by three casement windows in the living room, cross-ventilation in the bedroom, and one window in the bathroom. Duplex houses, furnishing accommodations for two families, cost $2,860. The cost of furniture for a duplex unit, including stove, refrigerator, oil space heater, double bed, dresser, two straight chairs for the bedroom, davenport, four straight chairs and table for the living room, and window shades, averages $217. For a single house the cost of furniture is $287, because these houses have two bedrooms, and a large refrigerator and stove. Duplex houses are convertible, so that when the emergency is over they can be made into single houses with more rooms. Contracts for houses include plumbing and electrical fixtures.

Usually about 60 days elapse from the time the contract is let until the houses are on the site. Four men can put up a house in 3 days. The

Our All

Our all is at stake, and the little conveniences and comforts of life, when set out in competition with our liberty, ought to be rejected, not with reluctance, but with pleasure.

—GEORGE MASON

437516—42——3

Farm Security Administration supervises the work, inspects, and accepts or rejects the job at the time of erection.

Dormitories

The dormitory program is designed to provide temporary shelter units for defense workers without families. Each dormitory houses 62 persons and contains double and single rooms, a heating plant, toilet and bathing facilities, and a lounge room. The average cost of a dormitory is $20,000.

Dormitories are operated with usual hotel services. Bed linens are changed twice weekly, and clean towels are furnished to each occupant daily. Rooms are furnished simply, with wooden equipment, and the average cost of furniture is $58 per person. Rentals range from $3.50 to $5 a week per person for double rooms and $5 to $7 a week for single rooms. In an effort to make rental charges conform to the rent levels of the locality, a survey of rates for similar accommodations is made before rates are fixed.

Since the housing program is designed to provide shelter for essential employees in designated munitions industries, an industrial plant must be certified by the Coordinator of Defense Housing before its employees become eligible for accommodations. The plant then submits employees' applications for approval by the manager of the housing project. The project manager works closely with the personnel offices of the plant and advises that office of the regulations and priorities to be used in accepting workers as tenants. When permanent housing is completed and a trailer camp is demobilized, the trailer tenants are given first consideration for the new houses.

Self-government by those who live in the housing projects is encouraged, and project managers work with committees representing occupants of dormitory, trailer, or housing units. Councils are sometimes formed. In Bremerton, Wash., where 7 dormitories provide facilities for 469 Navy Yard workers, a tenants' association, with the aid of the project staff, is responsible for governing the community under a monitor system and has drawn up a successful town constitution.

FSA makes an effort to work with all types of local groups—YMCA, YWCA, USO, Women's Clubs, Labor Councils, and others—to provide recreational facilities on its projects. Because of statutory limitations, little can be done directly to provide facilities and equipment for this purpose, but much can be done through cooperation with local organizations.

Our agricultural plant is tremendous. The resources for producing all the food which we need are here. We must encourage and secure the production of that food.

—HARRIET ELLIOTT

Putting Order into DRAINAGE PROGRAMS

By FRED A. CLARENBACH. *Two reasons for improving ways and means of drainage: The need for expanding food production and the possibility that land drainage may have a prominent place in a post-war rural works program.*

NOW WE are learning, in the compelling school of total war, that our Government and economic institutions must be strong, efficient, and adaptable.

We are learning that effective Government, equipped with the tools needed to do essential jobs promptly and well, is not only compatible with the common welfare but indispensable to it. This lesson will not be completely forgotten with the return of peace. Land drainage is one sphere within our agricultural economy that has long been characterized (in most States) by conditions of disorder.

Thousands of small virtually independent drainage districts have been organized at the initiative of local landowners or promoters by petition to a county board of commissioners or an inferior court. The administration of district affairs is usually in the hands of elected or appointed district commissioners or county supervisors. This extreme decentralization has often led to an inappropriate pattern of local districts, characterized by lack of coincidence of district boundaries with the limits of natural drainage areas, by numerous small districts, and by frequent overlapping of districts, rendering virtually impossible the coordinated system necessary to adequate and economical drainage in a single natural basin.

The typical lack of a State agency staffed by competent drainage technicians empowered to veto unsound projects has permitted the establishment of numerous poorly conceived and inefficiently engineered enterprises. District affairs have frequently been managed with great looseness. Assessments of benefits often have been inequitable; collection policies have been lax; methods of collection inadequate; and budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, and auditing seriously deficient. Excessive costs have been incurred for construction and for service of promoters, attorneys, engineers, bankers, and district officials.

Activities of Federal agencies have come to have an increasingly important bearing on land drainage. For many years the drainage engineers of the Department of Agriculture have engaged in basic research, conducted surveys, and have acted as consultants and advisers to States and districts. The work of the Army engi-

neers in the interest of flood control and navigation, particularly in and near the lower Mississippi Valley, has been of great benefit to drainage enterprises. More recently, large areas have been newly drained and the drainage works of other areas reconstructed and improved with WPA funds. Extensive rehabilitation of drainage works has also been accomplished by the CCC drainage camps. Finally the RFC has refinanced large numbers of bankrupt or defaulting drainage districts.

Such activities, though usually uncoordinated and sometimes tinged with pork-barrel elements, have without doubt been productive of great benefits. Nevertheless, they have sometimes resulted chiefly in rather direct benefits to private landowners, in the form of relief from costs of rehabilitation and maintenance which could have been done privately. Aid has been extended to small projects without planning on a larger, natural drainage area basis. Most disturbing of all, little or no attention has been paid to the possibility of attaching strings to Federal aid designed to obtain a rational readjustment in the geographical pattern of districts, efficient and responsible administration, and adequate supervision.

The unsatisfactory working of drainage districts as quasi-public corporations has long invited constructive attention from State and Federal agencies, but little improvement of a permanent character has been accomplished. Now, in addition to the standing peacetime objectives of efficiency in Government and in the utilization of land, we have at least two further reasons for seeking early improvement in the institutional framework within which land drainage is carried on.

Reasons

The first of these is the need for expansion of food production to meet our war requirements and those of our allies. Rehabilitation and extension of artificial drainage systems in some areas offer practicable means for making possible such expansion. Federal aid for a moderate amount of such work could be conditioned upon appropriate adjustment of the areal pattern of the drainage enterprises affected and upon the establishment, by State law, of satisfactory administrative and supervisory agencies. Even in the absence of Federal aid, the States themselves—particularly those of the Mississippi Delta, where settlement and clearing of wet lands has been going forward rapidly—should concern themselves with drainage and other legislation designed to eliminate the worst of the evils typically associated with such development.

A second special reason for giving prompt attention to improving drainage organization is the possibility that land drainage may have a prominent place in a post-war rural works program. It would be difficult to argue that large amounts of Federal monies, or funds from any source, should be spent without conditioning the expenditure upon the realization of badly needed reforms in drainage institutions.

Obviously, the kinds or types of organization for drainage should depend upon the job that needs to be done. Consideration must be given to the peculiar nature of the task of drainage in each region, to surrounding local institutions, to the inter-

Growing Up

As a Nation we are growing up—we are becoming more mature in our consideration of our resources. We now see more of the interdependency and interconnections in the use of our resources.

—CLAUDE R. WICKARD

relation of drainage with flood control and patterns of land use, and to other factors. No single "model plan" can be used in all regions. Diversity *per se* is not objectionable but may rather be desirable and necessary to care for peculiar local conditions.

Nevertheless, there would appear to be a hard core of minimum adjustments essential for effective drainage planning and administration.

Two major elements in such readjustment may be outlined as follows:

A. Establishment of a permanent and adequately staffed State agency (e. g., a "State Water Control Commission") or a division of an existing State agency in each drainage State, with power to approve or disapprove the organization of a drainage district; to review, revise, approve, or disapprove engineering and financial plans of districts; to supervise continuously districts, including activities of budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, auditing, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance; to set up and enforce personnel standards with respect to district engineers and other district employees; to promote coordination and reorganization of existing districts; and to authorize the lending of technical services.

B. Adoption of one, or a combination, of the following plans for district readjustment: Coordination of engineering plans and operations of existing districts; *or* establishment of larger intra-State districts on natural drainage area basis, involving *either* outright consolidation of existing small districts, *or* retention of existing small districts as legal entities for the purpose of retiring existing bonded indebtedness of districts, but lodging all future construction and maintenance with a larger district; (existing small districts having no indebtedness would be dissolved immediately, and remainder of small districts would be dissolved as soon as existing indebtedness is retired. Incurring of additional debt by existing small districts would be prohibited); establishment of interstate authorities to supplant or to supplement intrastate districts and their activities.

How Much?

Adequate planning of a drainage program involves, of course, much more than answering *how* questions. We must answer also questions of *whether, where,* and *how much.*

Considerations involved in these spheres include: National land requirements; the requirements of bet-

ter-balanced regional economies; the implications of drainage for crop control programs; the relation of drainage to resettlement and to tenure; malaria control; flood control and navigation; irrigation, in both its competitive and complementary aspects; and other factors.

Simple recital of these items suggests that the degree of national interest in land drainage is far from negligible.

For many years drainage interests have sought Federal financial aid, with some partial success during the last 8 years. If large amounts are eventually allocated for drainage works in a post-war rural works program, Federal agencies might well take a leading part in the difficult task of planning at least the major projects. Moreover, the release of funds should be conditioned upon the adoption by recipient States of appropriate general legislation respecting the organization, administration and supervision of drainage enterprises. The people of the United States cannot afford to buy merely drainage ditches and appurtenant works. If we decide to buy these things with public monies, we can and should insist on getting, in the same package, badly needed reforms in ways of managing drainage enterprises.

The States that showed the greatest percentage of increase in population in the 1940 Census were Florida, New Mexico, California, Nevada, and Idaho. The District of Columbia, however, exceeded the percentage increase of these States.

From 1790 to 1940, the proportion of people living in cities of 2,500 or more increased from 5.1 percent to 56.5 percent. There were 412 cities of 25,000 or more, compared to 376 in 1930. The number of people living in these cities of 25,000 or more was 52,535,767, compared to 50,016,533 in 1930.

The production of oleomargarine, butterine, nut margarine, and similar products showed a 23.5 percent decline between 1937 and 1939. Annual production now amounts to about $35,000,000. More than 300,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine are made.

Census records show that approximately 105 boy babies are born to 100 girl babies. The United States figures are about the same as world figures. The proportion of the population aged 65 to 70 nearly doubled between 1870 and 1930.

The manufacture of cooking and other edible fats and oils is a $200,000,000 annual industry in the United States. More than 1,400,000,000 pounds of edible vegetable and compound shortenings are made. Of this, 965,000,000 pounds are from vegetable oils and nearly 200,000 pounds from animal fats.

Gardens, Yes, but
WITH DISCRETION

By H. W. HOCHBAUM. *A tremendous interest in gardening is developing all over the Nation, but "The key to success in the garden program will have to come on the farm front. As in nutritional defense, garden defense can best be had where people live close to the soil."*

WHEN Secretary Wickard announced the Food for Freedom Program last September, he included a goal of 5,760,000 farm gardens, an increase of 1,400,000 farm gardens over the number reported in 1929 and an increase of 945,000 over the number reported for 1939. To achieve the goal set, nearly 97 percent of our farms must participate.

These farm gardens will be the hub around which the victory garden program revolves. Gardening will receive an additional incentive in the program agreed upon by the many public and private agencies that took part in the National Victory Garden Conference held at Washington in December. What this conference said, in effect, was that gardens will help America keep faith with the pledge of its leaders that this country will be the larder of democracy as well as its arsenal.

There are two main differences between the garden program of 1917 and 1918 and the victory garden program of this second World War. One is in objectives, the other is in organization.

The chief thought people had in the first World War was that there might be a shortage of food—at home, for our Army overseas, for our allies. Planting gardens on the front lawn and in the back yard released many acres to farmers for the growing of wheat and feed and meat. In those days farming had not advanced technologically as far as it has today. It was just beginning to be organized, as a part of the war effort, into the closely interwoven national production unit it is today.

Organizationally, the war-garden effort of the first World War was a more or less spontaneous effort on the part of a number of organizations, and there was lacking the close liaison now possible between the efforts of private groups and public educational agencies. The Extension Service and the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department, together with the land-grant colleges, did much to encourage local groups to promote more widespread growing of fruits and vegetables. The Food Administration and the United States Council of Defense also encouraged war gardens. The Bureau of Education established a school garden program; and horticultural

associations, publishers, and news associations sponsored some outstanding programs. Charles Lathrop Pack organized a National Volunteer War Garden Commission and contributed considerable sums of money to encourage the movement.

From all these efforts we stand to learn much in the garden program of the present war. The national conference of December 19–20 served to bring together on a national level all those interested in the war-garden effort.

Nearly 300 persons took part in the conference, and of this number fully 200 came from outside Washington. They represented a very wide range of private, commercial, trade, educational, and technical interests and agencies—garden clubs; youth organizations; farm organizations; garden, farm, horticultural, and seed trade associations and magazines; women's magazines; the press and radio; and schools and vocational agriculture. Specialists from State colleges and extension services, members of USDA Defense Boards, and representatives of the Office of Civilian Defense also attended.

At Home

The ground work for the garden conference had been laid jointly by an interbureau gardening committee of the Department of Agriculture and a similar group representing the nutrition subcommittee of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services. Better food habits, better health through better nutrition, and the need for common-sense planning of school and community garden programs were discussed.

Secretary Wickard gave the *why* of farm gardens in these words:

"Producing vegetables at home puts the food supply right where it is to be used; it doesn't take any freight cars or trucks to move the food to those families—and transport is needed badly for other things these days. Still another advantage of home vegetable gardens is that they release more of the commercial vegetable production for other uses—in feeding the rest of the American people, feeding the armed forces—and for lend-lease shipment to Britain. Commercially canned vegetables, of course, are packed in tin cans—and we are short of tin."

Director of Defense Health and Welfare Services Paul V. McNutt emphasized the need of gardens as a conservation measure:

"Preventing waste is at least as urgent today as it was in 1917 and may prove vastly more so in coming months. But conservation, as we now seek to practice it, is positive rather than negative; its object is not, as it once so largely was, to do *without* certain foods, but to utilize food wisely so that it may yield every last ounce of human health and strength and courage."

The program of the conference centered on two main features. First, the educational part—a presentation of our emergency situations and our garden needs and objectives. These were presented by authorities both from within and from without the Government. Some outstanding papers were read, including one on "War Gardens and State Councils of Defense," by Gov. Prentice Cooper of Tennessee, and one on "Research in the Nutritional Values of Fruits and Vegetables" by Dr. E. C. Auchter. The second main feature of the conference—the action part—took place in the

afternoon and evening of December 19 when six large committees, of one of which each delegate to the conference was a member, drew up a set of recommendations that will serve as the policy guide for the victory garden program of the second World War.

Recommendations

Committee recommendations generally advanced the following:

1. Farm people who have not gardened before should keep their garden plans relatively simple. On such farms from 8 to 10 vegetables should be the limit. These should include green leafy vegetables, yellow vegetables, tomatoes, root vegetables, and others which may be eaten fresh over a long season and stored without processing for winter use.

2. Grow as much fruit as possible, but only the kinds and varieties that are recommended to meet local climatic and other growing conditions.

3. Discourage the tearing up of back yards for the sake of growing a few vegetables, thereby wasting seed, fertilizer, and other materials. When community plots or large-scale school gardens can be located on fertile soil and accessible places, with supervision and adequate instruction and help available, such garden effort may be encouraged.

4. Maintain ornamental plantings and increase them where possible to brighten cantonment and camp areas, new homes in industrial centers, and aid in increasing love for home and country. England still holds her flower shows. Such interests aid in maintaining what we ordinarily call morale.

A Nation-wide educational program has now begun. Garden magazines, farm papers, and daily and weekly newspapers have joined with garden clubs, seed houses, and horticultural groups in publicizing the victory garden program. Circulars on garden needs and garden heeds are being prepared by State agricultural colleges and extension services and a number of Government agencies.

A National Garden Advisory Committee, representative of trade, educational, and private interests, will be appointed to serve in advancing the garden program nationally and to further public relations. Plans are under way to hold State garden conferences. These will follow the same general pattern as the national conference. Representatives of the various garden educational and trade interests will take part in adapting the program to State conditions and in making common plans for carrying the program into action.

The key to success in the garden program will have to come on the farm front. As in nutritional defense, garden defense can best be had where people live close to the soil. A considerable amount of educational work will be necessary in some States where, as a result of the commercializing of agriculture, people have forgotten how to garden; or, as in some areas, where they just never got into the habit of turning the available soil into the garden commodities which could be had for the enthusiasm and work it takes to make things grow.

This year, farmers should also be particularly vigilant against letting the farm labor shortage result in neglecting the family garden and thereby deprive the family of one

of the greatest assets farm people have for insuring vitality and strength to perform their part in the great war effort.

The amber caution light is being flashed to people who know nothing about gardening or who are situated in large cities and other places where other activities might be more helpful in winning the war than growing garden crops. People will be warned against starting gardens where they could not possibly expect to get a yield of fruits and vegetables in quantity and quality to compensate for the effort.

The usual shrubs, flowers, and other ornamental garden plants around a city or suburban home may be important from the standpoint of buoying up the spirits of the occupants under the stress and strain of the months that lie ahead. This part of the program furnishes a kind of "spiritual nutrition."

In connection with it, however, we must remember the words of Secretary Wickard when he said that the time taken in ornamental gardening should not "interfere with spending the amount of time needed in direct war service with the Red Cross, Civilian Defense units, or other activities of the local community directed immediately toward the war effort."

Planning

Agriculturists and economists do not want to overlook the importance of gardening in future planning. When planning committees meet in the counties and States to recommend next year's production goals, gardens and garden crops that are adapted locally should be given greater consideration than ever before. Farm gardens are now intimately tied in with the nutritional welfare of farm people. And nutritional welfare has become an integral part of planning.

An important point to stress in the garden educational program is the great variation in the adaptability of certain garden crops. Dr. E. C. Auchter discussed this at the Washington conference when he told of the many new researches which the Bureau of Plant Industry has under way. Attention is now being given to the importance of vitamins in the plant breeding research.

State extension services in almost every State and in cooperation with horticulturists, home economists, and nutritionists of the land-grant colleges, have worked out "vitamin calendars" or similar charts that help farm people decide which combination of vegetables will do best in their county and at the same time provide the greatest amount of home-grown vitamins. County agricultural and home demonstration agents, USDA Defense Board members, and farmers, as their part in the victory garden program, should provide themselves with a guide giving a recommended list of the best varieties for the county.

The victory garden program will help the American people, especially people in rural areas, benefit through better nutrition. Through growing more fruits and vegetables the program will help "make America strong by making Americans stronger." Through a coordinated, well-planned program we have the beginnings of a Nation-wide activity that should avoid many of the shortcomings of the war garden program of 25 years ago.

Farm Machinery:
I. PRIORITIES OF MATERIALS

By ERLING HOLE. *This is a review of regulations affecting metals, and a discussion of materials in machines.*

PLANES, ships, and tanks are made of the same kind of material as farm machinery. Because of the vast requirements of critical materials for producing the tools of war, the total quantity of new farm machinery available to United States farmers in 1942 will be only 80 percent of the quantity purchased in 1940.

This reduction makes it important to discuss farm machinery from the standpoint of priorities, materials, exports, recent domestic sales, factors of distribution, the total material allotment for 1940, repairs, and effective use.

During the spring and summer of 1941, manufacturers of farm machinery had to obtain individual priority ratings to acquire small but essential quantities of aluminum, nickel, and zinc.

The Farm Equipment Institute was one of the first trade associations to foresee the need for a "blanket" priority rating and filed briefs asking such action. In response, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply issued on July 23, 1941, a Civilian Allocation Program for materials used in making farm machinery and equipment.

Because OPM was to administer and enforce the program, it issued a farm machinery and equipment rating plan in two parts (for new machinery and repairs) which assigned a B–1 preference rating to materials for new machines. The order (P–33) expired October 31, 1941, was extended to November 30, and was amended and given an A–8 rating, expiring February 14, 1942. A new order (P–95) issued December 31, 1941, and expiring October 31, 1942, assigns the same rating (A–3) to both new machinery and repair parts. The original order entitled manufacturers to obtain 20 percent more materials for August, September, and October than the quantities used during the corresponding months of 1939 or 1940, whichever was higher.

A newer limitation order permits the industry to obtain 20 percent less material for the year November 1, 1941, through October 31, 1942, than the quantities used during the calendar year 1940. Quotas, established for each kind of machine or for groups of related kinds of machines, will govern the distribution of material to individual manufacturers.

Preference Rating Order No. P–32 assigning an A–10 preference rating to materials for repair parts was to expire on February 14, 1942, but is now replaced by P–95. No restriction on materials was established by the original order. Quotas cov-

ering the same year as for new machines are now established by classes of machines. These quotas are about 50 percent higher than the quantities used for parts in 1940.

Except for cast iron, the percentage of the total consumption of materials for all uses in manufacturing farm machinery in 1940 ranged from 0.3 percent for chromium to 3.3 percent for steel and rubber.

Although all the materials entering into the manufacture of farm machinery are scarce, compared to the large requirements of the war program, there are differences in the degree of scarcity. Copper, nickel, and aluminum are highly critical. The war in the Pacific seriously affects our future supplies of chromium, tin, and rubber. For tin and rubber, the East Indies have been our chief source of supply.

Tractors dominate in the farm machinery industry. Plows and listers require a considerable amount of steel, about one-third as much cast iron as steel, but only small quantities of a few of the other materials are needed to make them.

Harvesting machinery requires an even smaller ratio of cast iron to steel than plows and listers. This class of machinery, however, required quantities from the entire list of other metals with zinc in the lead. The requirements in dairy machinery include also the entire list except for molybdenum and cobalt. The proportions of nonferrous metals needed in dairy machinery is large relative to steel and cast iron.

Sales

About 79 percent of the farm machines produced in 1940 were sold for use in the United States. The rest were exported. Twenty-one percent of the tractors, 15 percent of all harvesting machinery, and 11 percent of all plows and listers were sold abroad. Except for elevators, all classes of machines were represented in export sales. The percentage was generally small, and for all other classes less than 8 percent—in fact, the United States was on a net import basis for cream separators in 1940.

The total quantity of farm machinery sold for use in the United States during the 6-year period 1935–40 was 6 percent smaller than the quantity sold in 1940; that sold in 1937 was probably larger than in 1940. During the depression years, the average quantity sold was but one-third of the sales in 1940. During 1925–30, 10 percent less was sold than in 1940. The 1929 quantity was probably roughly equal to the 1940 quantity. The quantity sold during the 4-year period 1921–24 was 40 percent less than that sold in 1940.

These comparisons demonstrate that the trend in total machinery purchases by United States farmers has been upward during the last 20 years. As there has been a trend toward smaller units, the upward trend in number of machines has been larger than that indicated by total material requirements.

Estimating on the basis of the average life of machines, the bulk of the machines bought during the 1920's are probably already replaced by new machines. Most of the machines purchased during the depression years are probably still in use. Practically all the machines purchased since 1935 can be considered to be in use. Because of the large purchases since 1935, it can be concluded that the larger share of farm

Use of metals in machines, 1940

Kind of material	Consumption		Percentage that consumption for farm machinery was of all uses
	All uses	Farm machinery [1]	
Metals:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Percent*
Steel [2]	38,500,000	1,269,899	3.3
Cast iron [3]	4,006,583	779,674	19.5
Chromium [4]	502,000	1,354	.3
Nickel [5]	76,000	435	.6
Molybdenum [6]	8,500	165	1.9
Cobalt [7]	600	18	3.0
Zinc [8]	719,000	15,879	2.2
Copper [8]	1,070,000	12,127	1.1
Lead [8]	782,000	4,606	.6
Tin [8]	83,008	1,539	1.9
Aluminum [4]	296,000	1,601	.5
Antimony [5]	29,400	186	.6
Rubber [4]	641,000	21,397	3.3

[1] Farm Equipment Institute.
[2] American Iron and Steel Institute: Steel in finished steel products (70 percent conversion rate from ingots employed) Sold to United States industry—i. e., represents billings not ultimate consumption.
[3] Census of Manufacture, 1939: Represents production for sale and interplant transfers of grey iron, semisteel, and malleable castings.
[4] Materials for Defense—O. E. M. The Arsenal of Democracy Series.
[5] Bureau of Mines: Apparent consumption of primary metal with no adjustments for stocks plus metal recovered from scrap (1940 new supply).
[6] O. P. M. estimate: Obtained from the industry and represents estimated consumption by steel manufacturers.
[7] O. P. M. estimate: Represents the industry's estimate of *metal* consumption only.
[8] Yearbook of the American Bureau of Metal Statistics, 1940.

machines now in use on farms are of relatively recent models. Although the purchases in 1940 were large in comparison with the average during recent years, they should be interpreted on the basis of a steadily upward trend. As farms are more mechanized, more machinery is required for replacement.

It is estimated that 24 percent more machines were made in 1941 for domestic use than were sold in 1940.

The decided increase in estimated farm machinery sales in 1941 reflects the rising tide of farm purchasing power as restrictions on materials for manufacture was not felt except for a few instances. Were it not for restrictions on materials, a quantity 40 percent larger than in 1940 could probably be sold in 1942.

The Supply Priorities and Allocations Board decided in October 1941, to limit materials to make new farm machinery for domestic use for 1942 to 80 percent of 1940. An Interbureau Committee on Farm Machinery Needs for 1942, which was appointed by the Secretary in July

Materials used in farm machinery by classes of machines that required more than 10 percent of total, United States, 1940

Material and class of machine	Percentage of total requirements	Material and class of machine	Percentage of total requirements
Steel:	Percent	Copper:	Percent
Tractors	30	Tractors	36
Plows and listers	12	Domestic water systems	27
Harvesting machinery	10	Lead:	
Cast iron:		Other miscellaneous [1]	63
Tractors	53	Tin:	
Chromium:		Tractors	50
Tractors	65	Dairy machinery	14
Dairy machinery	27	Poultry equipment	14
Nickel:		Aluminum:	
Tractors	43	Tractors	42
Dairy machinery	38	Engines	34
Molybdenum:		Dairy machinery	15
Tractors	98	Antimony:	
Cobalt:		Other miscellaneous [1]	37
Tractors	73	Tractors	17
Zinc:		Engines	16
Tractors	23	Rubber:	
Domestic water systems	18	Tractors	86
Other miscellaneous [1]	14		

[1] Corn cribs, grain bins, and silos, etc.

Compiled from a report by the Farm Equipment Institute to the United States Department of Agriculture.

1941, made suggestions to the Office of Production Management on the best distribution of this total allotment by kinds of machinery. The quotas for the year November 1, 1941, through October 31, 1942, which have now been set are, with some exceptions, those suggested by the Interbureau Committee.

The committee made suggestions for a distribution that would best meet the situation in view of labor shortage and production goals. The estimates for each of the some 250 individual kinds and sizes of machines were principally based on the following factors: Trend in sales of machines with an appraisal of 1940 as a base year, the inventory and ages of farm machines on farms now, relative ease with which machines can be repaired, substitute materials, material requirements per machine, suitability for custom work, cooperative organization and the like, labor-saving characteristics, minimum replacement needs, number of horses expected to be substituted by tractors, expected changes in types of farming in some regions, notably in the South, and reports from county defense boards for 30

important kinds of machines on inventory, purchases in 1940 and 1941, and needs for 1942, together with rating of machines most needed.

The present status of efficiency with which the agricultural plant operates is in a large measure due to the use of farm machinery for a variety of operations. This efficiency must be maintained. But to maintain it in the face of a reduction in new farm machinery requires that all machinery, new and old alike, be put to effective use. This is the more important for 1942 because the reduction in the larger units tend to be relatively larger than in the smaller units.

The good-neighbor policy is just as applicable in the different farming communities as in the Western Hemisphere. The use of especially the larger units of machines can be extended by custom work or cooperative arrangement of various kinds. The necessity of a more intensive use of machines the coming and next few years sets the limit to substitution of materials lest much substitution impair the quality.

The farm population in 1940 was 30,151,076, a decrease of about 6,000 in 10 years, or a decline in its percentage of the whole population from 24.6 to 22.9.

Among the odd occupations discovered by census-takers in 1940 were fishworm rancher, whistle-tester, ham-sniffer, and egg-breaker.

The per capita production of cigarettes in the United States yearly has reached an equivalent of 68 packs of 20 cigarettes each.

Among the types of farms recorded in the 1940 Census were lion and ostrich farms in Southern California.

The three States reporting the largest annual consumption of sugar in food manufactures are New York, 757,427,292 pounds; Illinois, 607,901,373 pounds; and Pennsylvania, 469,170,604.

The United States malt industry annually consumes more than 61 million bushels of barley in malt manufacture.

The population group known as "rural-nonfarm," consisting of those who reside in villages of less than 2,500 and other nonagricultural rural residents, showed the greatest increase in the latest Census. This group increased 14.5 percent while the farm population remained stationary and urban population increased by 7.9 percent.

The biggest users of sugar are the 18,000 bakeries in the United States—more than 1,250,000,000 pounds.

Farm Machinery:
II. THE REPAIR PROGRAM

By C. H. BERNHARD. *The farm machinery repair program is something new—"a period of adjustment is inevitable; but the speed of the national war effort demands that any such adjustment be made as quickly as possible."*

WITH THE START of the planting season a little less than a month away for some southern crops that are a vital part of the food for freedom campaign, and planting scheduled to begin in other parts of the United States soon after, the urgency of the farm-machinery repair campaign is becoming increasingly apparent.

Added incentive—if such were needed—was given efforts to persuade farmers to order necessary replacement parts for their machinery at once by an order of the Office of Production Management. On December 28, OPM announced further restrictions on the allocation of material for the production of new farm machinery.

The prospect of greatly reduced supplies of new machinery and farm labor is such that officials of the Department of Agriculture see serious obstacles to a realization of the 1942 production goals for food and fiber unless farmers come to an immediate appreciation of the necessity for surveying their need for replacement parts for all essential farm machinery and placing orders for these parts with their dealers at once. And in this case, the term "at once" calls for a completely literal interpretation.

If farm operators have been made conscious of the necessity for quick action, and if they are taking that action, it is believed that the situation is well in hand and that farmers will experience a minimum of difficulty in the production of the desired quantities of the agricultural commodities needed. This belief is rooted in the extensive and careful survey of farm machinery part needs made by the Department through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration as a member agency of the county USDA defense boards.

This survey, launched early in June, sent county and community committeemen to virtually every farm in the United States provided with a form on which farmers were asked to check machinery they owned and the expected need for repair parts necessary to place such machinery in peak working order during the 1942 growing season.

The response was gratifyingly complete, and provided experts in the Department with fairly accurate data on which they were able to form tentative estimates of the overall requirements of the Nation's agricultural plant for machine parts

of all descriptions during the forthcoming year. In the hands of staff members of the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations and, later, the Office of Production Management, these estimates of parts were reduced to estimates in terms of raw materials—various types of steel and iron—and steps were taken to see that adequate allocations of metal for parts were made to manufacturers of farm machinery equipment.

With a number of industries, both directly and indirectly associated with the war production effort, seeking priorities, OPM was faced with the necessity of making a limited supply of steel cover a number of needs. In the case of agriculture, it was decided from the outset that steel would be available for the manufacture of machine parts at the expense of new machinery output.

Indicators Needed

With the outbreak of hostilities on December 7, a general tightening up of the priorities system was obviously in order to anticipate an intensification of industrial production for direct war needs. Accordingly, on December 28, OPM announced a new program cutting the material available for the manufacture of new farm machinery to 83 percent of the material supply available for similar uses in 1940, while at the same time increasing the supply of material for repair parts to an average rate of about 150 percent of the 1940 level.

The effect of this action by OPM is to throw into distinct relief a fact that has been reiterated ever since the start of the farm-machinery repair campaign: That realization of the aims of the 1942 food for freedom production goals will in large measure rest upon the effective utilization of repaired and reconditioned farm machinery.

Mere allocation of materials—basically important as such an allocation is—does not in itself solve the problem, however. The A–3 rating given to manufacturers to assist them in obtaining an adequate material supply will be of little value to the agricultural war effort unless those manufacturers are given some fairly accurate indicator, some real yardstick, by which they can gauge the volume of demand for repair parts. Prudent operation of any plant requires that some fairly reliable estimate of probable demand be on hand to prevent overstocking. The fear is that farmers, not appreciating the time it will take manufacturers to fill what is expected to be an unusually heavy volume of parts replacement orders, will follow their usual custom of waiting until shortly before the equipment is needed to place their parts orders with dealers.

As soon as farmers fully realize the extent of the curtailment in the production of new farm machinery, and appreciate the daily inroads that are being made upon the supply of available farm labor, they will undoubtedly take steps to obtain needed parts at once. Thus the key to the problem appears to be an extensive information program to acquaint farmers with the facts of the situation and to induce them to immediate action.

In fixing the limitation placed upon the manufacture of new machinery, OPM's Division of Civilian Supply worked in close cooperation with the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations and the farm ma-

chinery industry to the end that as much new machinery as possible could be manufactured to assist farmers in meeting production goals of vital foods. Conversely, the production of new machinery in less vital fields was heavily cut. In some cases, these cuts will entirely eliminate the manufacture of some types of machinery.

Some idea of the coordination of the OPM order with the objectives of the Food for Freedom campaign may be gained from a consideration of the following new machinery quotas for 1942, expressed as percentages of the 1940 production:

Garden planters, tractor-drawn, 121 percent; horse-drawn disk plows, 73 percent; steel plowshares, 71 percent; horse or tractor-drawn beet cultivators, 77 percent; potato diggers, walking-plow type, 100 percent; pea and bean harvesters, 105 percent; hay-press combines (windrow pick-up), 353 percent.

Pea and bean threshers, 106 percent; peanut pickers, 208 percent; hand feed grinders and crushers, 100 percent; tractors, wheel type special purpose (belt horsepower under 30 with steel tires), 59 percent; garden tractors, 100 percent; milking machines, 206 percent; cream separators (capacity 351–500 pounds per hour), 213 percent; milk coolers (walk-in), 179 percent; butter-making equipment, 144 percent; brooders (oil), 100 percent; portable corn cribs, none; silos, 90 percent; wheelbarrows (wooden), 100 percent; wheelbarrows (steel), none.

The situation regarding production of attachments and parts shows slight variations, the average being 150 percent of the 1940 quota. Even here, however, every effort has been made to take into account classes of machinery that will be particularly valuable because of the crop or product upon which they are used. Some idea of this may be obtained from the following:

Planting, seeding, and fertilizing machinery, 140 percent; cultivators and weeders, 150 percent; harvesting machinery, 160 percent; haying machinery, 150 percent; machines for preparing crops for market or use, 140 percent; spraying outfits, 140 percent; farm elevators, 140 percent; pneumatic domestic water systems, 160 percent; barn and barnyard equipment, 150 percent; poultry-farm equipment, 160 percent.

A schedule of permissible production on every type of farm equipment, from wind mills to wheelbarrows, has been sent to each one of the approximately 1,200 concerns making up the farm machinery industry.

The limitation order, running from November 1, 1941, to October 31, 1942, places special emphasis on the necessity for adopting conservation measures, and requires manufacturers to undertake plans for substitution, redesign and respecification in order to eliminate as far as possible, use of scarce materials.

The farm machinery repair program is, of course, something entirely without precedent in agricultural history. Because it is so new, a period of adjustment is inevitable. But the speed of the national war effort demands that any such adjustment be made as quickly as possible. Indications are that once the facts and their implications are fully known, agriculture will meet the challenge of what has indeed come to be a changing world.

Apples Didn't Keep THE DOCTOR AWAY

By EDWIN F. LANDERHOLM. *On October 2, 1940, seven fruit growers formed an Agricultural Planning Committee in the Wenatchee-Okanogan district of Washington. What the movement they started did to help four distressed counties is related here.*

THE DEPRESSION hit hard the once prosperous Wenatchee-Okanogan district in north central Washington, whose 40,000 acres of orchards (with those of the Yakima Valley) used to produce one-fourth of the commercial apples in the United States.

Prices fell. Other fruits competed more with apples. Ills, forgotten in the lush 1920's, became glaringly apparent.

The growers saw that some of the orchards were on poor land; some had mostly the poorer varieties. Many irrigation districts serving the orchards had high water costs. Some orchards, because of improper spacing of trees, could not produce top quality fruit. Credit shrank and financing of production became difficult. Entire orchards were abandoned, and created a serious pest hazard. During the 1930's, despite various efforts by local groups and Federal and State agencies, the deterioration continued.

Special financial aid and other help were obtained from the Federal Government through the united efforts of merchants, bankers, brokers, and farmers, the principal assistance being aimed at problems of production, but these efforts failed to provide any lasting solution to the fruit growers' problems and, indeed, came to be regarded as no more than stop-gap in nature.

By mid-1940 the United States Department of Agriculture recognized the need for more effective action and set up an Interbureau Coordinating Committee to study the problems. Two men were sent to get first-hand information from the growers; a report was issued on the subject, and a worker was stationed at Wenatchee to act as representative of the Department.

In October 1940 came the organization of the district agricultural planning committee to act as a "voice for the farmers" in their cooperative planning and action with Government representatives. Only seven fruit growers attended the first meeting; from this small beginning rapidly sprang a vigorous movement reaching out into the four counties of the area—Chelan, Okanogan, Douglas, and Grant.

The area-wide planning movement had its birth in the establishment of a district agricultural planning committee composed of mem-

bers of the agricultural planning committees in the four counties, cooperating with the businessmen's committee of Wenatchee, representatives of the State Extension Service, Experiment Station, and agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

Local farmers, businessmen, and other groups threw their support behind the deliberations and recommendations of the district agricultural planning committee. This group, a short time after its organization, prepared a report that listed the problems of the fruit industry and made numerous proposals for solution. These proposals have formed the basis for a streamlined flow of action toward solving the problems.

As part of the program, the 22 community agricultural planning committees in the area mapped the district — the orchards that should remain in production and those that would need to be destroyed to save the area. The maps served to marshal support for orchard sanitation and to develop plans for tree protection.

The maps were used in conjunction with a sanitation bill, adopted by the Washington Legislature in January 1941, which enabled State horticultural inspectors to designate orchards that ought to be removed and to remove them immediately. Seven tractors were employed daily to root out infested trees in neglected orchards—about 3,800 acres of trees were uprooted.

The district agricultural planning committee's report and proposals tried to cover every phase of fruit production, including the credit needs and other requirements prerequisite to adequate programs of spraying, fertilizing, thinning, pruning, tree spacing, determination of marginal trees and varieties, and need for improvement in harvesting and supervision.

More Help

The State College of Washington furnished a calendar of proper spraying dates and the local branch of the Agricultural Experiment Station devoted full attention to spraying needs and many other production problems. The State experiment station recommended fertilizers best adapted to varying conditions of soil, climate, and varieties, and made recommendations about proper spacing of trees.

As an outgrowth of the proposals, the Department of Agriculture called into action the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, a unit of the Farm Credit Administration. Early in 1941 the RACC was set up at Wenatchee to help finance the operations of the growers through various types of loans. During the 1941 season, $4,300,000 was lent 630 growers.

Community financing committees were formed, composed of one farmer selected from the community planning committee, one horticultural inspector chosen by the RACC from a group nominated by the community committee, and one RACC loan supervisor. The financing committees helped in the financing program on a community level, by providing supervisory assistance in production problems and by reviewing loan applications.

With the widening of planning activities, commissioners of Chelan, Douglas, and Okanogan Counties put through an emergency appro-

priation to hire an extension county agent for the district. Under his direction, a district agricultural planning office was established at Wenatchee, one of its first jobs being to ask (by questionnaires) 2,200 growers whether they wished to obtain financial assistance from the RACC, information on production for the past 3 years, and for a statement of the grower's net worth. This information provided the groundwork for the RACC's lending program.

The district agricultural planning committee, in cooperation with the RACC, assisted a wholesale cooperative to make quantity purchases of box shook, fertilizers, spray material, and the like. The arrangement saved growers approximately $100,000 in 1941.

A clearing house was formed to set a price at which given varieties, sizes, and grades of apples should be sold on a given day. During the short time that the clearing house has operated, the price of apples and pears has been kept at a fairly constant level, even under difficult marketing conditions caused by larger than normal yields of Delicious apples, and untoward weather conditions that caused market upsets elsewhere.

Lower freight rates to practically all shipping points in the United States were obtained as a result of negotiations by the agricultural planning committees and others. Lower power rates for pumping and irrigation purposes were granted by local power companies.

Numerous problems remain unsolved in the area, but a Department-State college research program has been started to assist the agricultural planning committees in finding solutions. Outstanding difficulties include the rehabilitation of land formerly used for orchards. A tree census to help obtain the long-time outlook for the area has been started. A land classification to determine the best use of all land in the area is planned.

False men were afraid and feigned blindness;
Some laid their legs under them as such liars can do,
And made their moan for mercy.

"This is a wild way without a leader
"To follow each foot," said the folk together.
But Perkin the Plowman answered, "By Saint Peter,
"I have half an acre to harrow by the highway!"

—The Vision of Piers Plowman

Books

PAYING FOR DEFENSE. *Albert Gailord Hart and Edward D. Allen.* The Blakiston Company, Philadelphia. 272 pages.

by GERHARD J. ISAAC

SINCE THIS book appeared, two events have occurred that have an important bearing on its theme. The United States has formally become involved in the war, and the Revenue Act of 1941 has become law. The chief effect of the first is to make the title obsolete; the second modifies but does not essentially change the fiscal background. In short, the ideas presented are still pertinent and worthwhile.

The authors' purpose is to present "a study of fiscal policy, focused on the problem of inflation, but stressing also the need to use fiscal powers to stimulate production, to guide production into channels helpful to defense, and to distribute these burdens fairly." The concern over the potential danger and results of unrestrained inflation thus colors the entire presentation.

The problems foreseen under the defense program as it existed when the book was written are even more important since our entry into the war. The question posed by the authors is in effect that of how to control inflation during a period when a large part of our productive effort is absorbed by defense requirements. The basic element in their solution is simple. Sufficient consumer income must be drawn off so as to keep consumer spending in line with consumer goods output.

AS BACKGROUND for their program of defense financing the authors discuss at length various types of financing in relation to inflationary effects. The effects of different forms of taxation are discussed and one section is devoted to war financing abroad. The space utilized for different phases is somewhat unevenly proportioned probably because of the division of authorship. Actually the book is a symposium developed by the two authors in collaboration with other members of the Economics staff of Iowa State College.

In their program for financing defense the authors recognize that this is not the time for general tax reform. Thus they accept the existing tax system as a starting point and specifically state that "no existing federal taxes—whatever their defects—can well be repealed at this juncture without a strong showing of necessity." The conclusion reached is that "the basic defense taxes should be additional taxes on personal incomes." Their program also calls for substantial excess profits taxes and excise taxes, the latter to apply only to goods whose production conflicts with defense.

The personal income tax is held to be the only effective way of draining off income and keeping consumer spending in line with consumer goods output. It is pointed out that to be effective as an inflation curb an income tax must be collected more promptly than is now the case. Usually this can be accomplished through arrangements for withholding at the source, though in some situations other devices will be necessary. The authors probably would consider the personal income tax exemption and rate structures in the Revenue Act of 1941 steps in the right direction, particularly if the taxpayer meets his tax liability with Tax Savings Notes purchased during the year the income is received.

The specification that a flexible rate structure is essential to make possible rapid adjustment to offset inflationary tendencies, however, is not met.

TAX RATES should be geared to a cost-of-living index. If rising prices show a need, tax rates should be increased. The technique suggested is that a high basic rate be written into the revenue act but that part of the rate should be suspended. Rules also should be provided in the law for raising the effective rate as required. If the statutory statement of policy were explicit and publicly understood it would matter little whether the rate changes were made effective through congressional resolution or Treasury announcement.

It appears doubtful if it will be politically expedient to adopt a tax program as extreme as that presented in "Paying for Defense." But there is no doubt that the final program will be more adequate if there is widespread reading and discussion of provocative books such as this.

HOUSING FOR HEALTH. *Allan A. Twichell, Editor.* Committee on the Hygiene of Housing, American Health Association. Lancaster, Pa. The Science Press Printing Company. 221 pages.

by CAROLINE BOYER

PUBLIC HEALTH and public housing can no longer be considered separate civic problems. It is time to recognize that adequate solution of American housing problems is more wisely accomplished with the combined efforts of three sciences—engineering, medical, and social.

The United States Housing Authority and the United States Public Health Service brought about satisfactory working relationships among local health agencies and housing authorities. One of the strongest integrating forces arise from the fact that new opportunity for constructive public health work in low-rent housing projects is widely recognized by official voluntary health agencies and housing authorities. The recognition of common interests has led to the creation of joint committees, an exchange of basic data and better forms of official cooperation. This trend toward the combining of mind power and plans augurs well for steady accomplishment in future housing programs.

Three major types of health activities have been developed in housing projects. Provision may be made for official health center facilities in or near a project. Often child-hygiene programs are developed. Usually tenant organizations make plans for group medical care.

THE GROSS requirements of health, comfort, and safety is the fundamental right of the broad mass of population. The provision of decent living quarters for the lower economic groups at rents that group can afford to pay is the sole practical answer to housing problems. Construction economies must not be obtained at the expense of fundamental health and social living. Public housing projects are now creating a radically new pattern of healthful and civic urban living. Housing should build neighborhoods as well as homes.

The sociologist considers family life the basis for home planning. He sees the need for conscious integration of the work of architects, project managers, and sociologists. The architect is seldom trained to visualize social functions of the house he designs. By deciding upon this or that design, the architect influences the formation of family habits. He underestimates the use of the house as the center of many diversified activities of the family and its individuals.

THE ARCHITECT and sociologist should be mutually helpful in an attempt to make adequate scientific investigations in the housing field. Results of this cooperation should have a beneficial effect on construction of single-family and multiple dwellings in both public and private housing.

Serious efforts must be made to provide low-income families with recreational facilities. From well-planned surveys, the characteristics and recreation habits of the population in the housing community could be learned. Efficient administration and trained leadership are just as important as adequate facilities for recreation. It is desirable to increase coordination between recreation and school authorities for use of playgrounds, gymnasiums, and auditoriums. The American citizen should be willing to give recreation a place in the community comparable to that held by public education. Housing codes, surveys, and inspection procedures are essential devices for progress and are particularly desirable as guides for remedial action in slum areas.

Important challenging points like these are set forth in this volume, a compilation of papers by members of the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing, American Public Health Association. The contributions deal with house codes and surveys, slum clearance, health facilities in housing projects, problems of recreation, heating, light and noise control, and new technical possibilities in hosiery construction, and medical and social impacts of good and bad housing.

THE PUBLICATION presents authoritative, current information on phases of the national housing movement.

A number of graphs, charts, tables, and study sheets adds to the completeness and clarity. Clearly defined objectives and conclusions are prominent in each article. *Housing*

for Health should be a valuable source book for many public housing and health officials and workers and for many other interested persons, architects, building engineers, home economists, and graduate students. A valuable appendix discusses *Basic Principles of Healthful Housing.*

---

12 MILLION BLACK VOICES. *Richard Wright.* New York. Viking Press. 142 pages.

by CONSTANCE E. H. DANIEL

LESS THAN 2 years ago, Richard Wright's Chicago epic, "Native Son," jarred American sensibilities and opened American minds to a shocked realization of the social virus that "accommodated" thinking has unwittingly stored up for us in northern ghettos these many years. This year in "12 Million Black Voices," Wright speaks again—this time for that nine-tenths of the Negro population which most urgently needs to be heard.

There is nothing new in what Wright has to say. It has all been said before. Charles Johnson, Arthur Raper, Hortense Powdermaker have told the story of the Negro on the land in *Shadow of the Plantation, Preface to Peasantry,* and *After Freedom;* Franklin Frazier and others have told the story of the Negro in the towns; the problems of the Negro on the labor front have been set forth by Cayton and Mitchell; while Carter Woodson has spent half a lifetime in the over-all job of research and editing in the Negro historical field.

But Wright, while offering nothing new, presents his theme with an accuracy, sincerity, and vigor that duplicates nothing which has so far been done. This is understandable in the light of his background, which has in it more than its share of the bewilderment and conflict and hurt which he interprets.

Consequently we need not expect him to write of things pleasant and reassuring—nor does he. War news is not pleasant, and without doubt Wright is as badly needed today as are the European correspondents who recently pronounced their own work worthless because of America's failure to respond to their warnings of impending peril.

THIS NEW AUTHOR'S contributions are less to literature than to life. He is starkly dramatic because his facts are starkly dramatic. His word pictures, drawn briefly in bold outlines that compel attention, share the clarity of the photographic illustrations. The man on the street can understand his devastating paragraphs on the "middle passage," can understand his passionate statement of fact on the slave trade that built Liverpool and Boston as well as Charleston—which involved Jew as well as Gentile; can understand that the economic urge has smeared Protestant, Catholic, and Jew alike with the furtive dishonesty of restrictive covenants, the open dishonesty of threatened—and accomplished—violence.

Wright, apparently, has taken to himself the job of arousing America to a realization of the kind of structure the forces of reaction are building within a great democracy. He points out the weak timbers beneath

the paint and names them. In approximately 70 pages of text, he says, in effect, "We are all in this house, weakened by the specious rationalization of an undemocratic, self-centered economics which is in contradiction to the national interest. Unless we move to strengthen it, it must surely fall and destroy us."

Because, in warning against forces which would jerry-build our national structure, he is disturbing, Wright will not be too popular among either white or Negro readers. Many who heard him speak at Houston, Tex., last June, when he recived the Spingarn Medal for outstanding Negro achievement, assailed him as a defeatist. And because, in *12 Million Black Voices,* he does not specify the material that must be used to shore up our house, he lays himself open to a repetition of this attack. The shape of a worthy structure is indicated, however, in his comments on reaction to the depression, in which he points both to the blind revolt of Harlem's untrained and unorganized blacks against economic oppression in 1935, which cost New York City $2,000,000, and to the increased acceptance, in recent years, of the fact of identity of interests among working people of all races.

TWENTY YEARS ago Dallas Lore Sharpe said more subtly, "Delightful and wise as it might seem to have it otherwise, the wish to be American is violently contagious." Wright says today, "We want what others have, the right to share in the upward march of American life, the only life we remember or have ever known * * *. We are with the new tide * * *. Men are moving! And we shall be with them * * *."

Soul

In its profoundest sense farming is the civilization you carry in your soul as you plow the dirt and manage the flocks and fields.

—JOHN M. BREWSTER

Certainly, and thank God for that, he is no professional optimist—but neither is he a defeatist. When he tells his fellow Americans that in black folk they will find a mirror of all American experience, that, "What we want, what we represent, what we endure, America *is*," he describes both himself and his task.

He is a chronicler of fact, unpleasantly objective, but tremendously useful timber in a country whose every weak spot, we now know, must be buttressed for generations to come.

12 Million Black Voices will doubtless produce more thought than enthusiasm, which perhaps, is what the author intended.

Most of the 147 pictures which form more than half the book were selected by Edwin Rosskam and are the work of Roy Stryker's photo-researchers in Farm Security Administration's Historical Section.

Skillfully woven into Wright's text they become an integral part of the unforgettable picture which this volume presents.

Letters

SIR:

Severe criticisms of material on types of tenure areas in the South, presented at a round table discussion at Nashville in May 1941, were published in the November issue of the LAND POLICY REVIEW. Although the map used in the discussion was plainly marked "preliminary" and its purposes were clearly stated, some questions raised in Mr. Ham's article are of such fundamental importance to American farm people and to the Department of Agriculture in its effort to serve them that further clarification seems desirable.

These tenure areas, it was alleged, are being erected upon the "flimsy base" of bringing "the hired farm worker into landed agricultural circles."

If the phrase "hired farm worker" does not include sharecroppers, a plea of "not guilty" must be entered, for there was no endeavor whatsoever in the Nashville paper to bring hired farm laborers into landed agricultural circles—to give them tenure status as members of the landholding hierarchy.

In the Nashville presentation, "all agricultural groups regardless of their present relation to the land" were considered "because it appears that any comprehensive discussion of the economic and social conditions underlying the tenure situation in the South makes it necessary."

It is necessary because: (*a*) of "much moving up and down the agricultural ladder"; (*b*) in some areas "there is neither a clear-cut economic nor social distinction between some of the tenure groups"; (*c*) in many places "it makes very little difference whether the man who tills the soil is a tenant, a laborer, or a sharecropper"; and (*d*) "the higher tenure groups press down on the tenants while the lower groups press up against them". (The word "tenure" was omitted advisedly from the phrase, "the lower groups.")

This position and the reasons underlying it are generally accepted. Note this statement: "The close relationship between farm tenants and farm laborers, and the rapidity with which agricultural workers in some parts of the country shift from one status to another make it necessary to consider farm tenancy as closely related to farm labor " This quotation, from the October 1941 issue of *Farm Population and Rural Life Activities*, is the introductory statement describing a cooperative study in Southeastern Missouri.

One objective of this study as stated in the cooperative agreement, goes a step further, however, and rather directly places laborers on the tenure ladder. This objective is: "To determine the extent of changes in the number and in the tenure status of farm laborers, sharecroppers, tenants, and owners; the reasons for such changes and their economic and social significance."

According to the criterion employed in Mr. Ham's supercritical comments, would not this also represent "a regrettable debasement of our verbal coinage"?

If, on the other hand, sharecroppers are included in the phrase "hired farm worker," the plea is: "Guilty, as charged!"

Economists and sociologists, however, generally use the term "sharecroppers" in the same sense as that presented in the Census reports. The 1940 Census defines croppers as "share tenants to whom their landlords furnish all of the work animals or tractor power in lieu of work

animals." The reasons for using an accepted vernacular in an open forum are obvious.

Mr. Ham said that tenure areas are described "as being delimited by reference to six items, only one of which, however, appeared to be taken into account in drawing up the map," the one being "geographical distribution and relative density of the several tenure categories."

Even a hasty examination of the delineation and description should show conclusively that more than one factor was used in both delineation and description. Certainly, control and supervision (Item 2) were important in delimiting the plantation areas. Control and supervision are the essence of the plantation system of land tenure. The use of race or color (parts of Item 6) is exemplified by the type and area entitled, "Indian Ownership." Furthermore, it was admitted that two areas (5 and 6, presumably) were "classified on a basis of farm size." Size of farm in this situation is related to Item 3—"density of population and amount of productive land available."

The title, *Subsistence Owners and Tenants,* given to area 7, does not indicate, as alleged, that this area was classified on the basis of the "presence of 'subsistence owners and tenants.'" In the description of this area we find, "Here, the population is large in terms of the land resources." Is not this a clear recognition of Item 3?

Likewise, the title, "Intensive Labor," given to Area 4, neither indicates nor implies that the farm labor situation was totally determinative or that laborers were brought "into landed agricultural circles." Titles given the areas are not intended to describe all factors used in making the classification. Witness: "Rurban," the title assigned to Area 9, and "Miscellaneous city areas," etc., used in type of farming studies, and "Eastern metropolitan," etc., designating *rural* cultural regions.

In addition, the six items listed, as indicated, were *only* "some of the most important items" used in the classification. Consideration of other items, the labor situation and proximity to cities, for example, certainly was legitimate.

Commenting on the whole classification, Mr. Ham says that the adjective "mixed," which is a part of the name given to Area 10, "one ruefully concludes, appears to apply to the whole classification."

For the purposes at hand, systematic classification and "pure" areas were not essential; neither was a definite dividing line between the areas necessary. It was clearly stated that "there is considerable overlapping of tenure conditions among areas, as well as variations in the tenure conditions within any given area. Despite the many limitations that may apply to such generalized areas, it is believed that they should help to orient our discussions." Unsystematic classification and "impure" areas are used throughout the social sciences. Note again type of farming areas and rural cultural regions.

"The motives for this attempt to endow wage workers with tenure status" it was said, "undoubtedly arose out of a recognition that in all the social reform legislation of recent years the farm laborer has been neglected."

As indicated, there was no attempt "to endow wage workers with tenure status," but even if there had been, why assume that the motive was anything other than that stated positively in the introduction of the Nashville discussion? Are we to be accused of insincerity when we say that "any comprehensive discussion of the economic and social conditions underlying the tenure situation in the South makes it necessary to consider all agricultural groups regardless of their present relation to the land"? The failure of those responsible for securing favorable legislation for hired farm laborers never entered into the consideration.

Endless

This land is great because it is a land of endless challenge.

—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Quoting further from Mr. Ham's article: "It is a fair question, however, whether anything is gained by trying to demonstrate a common tenure status."

Even if that had been done—we believe we have shown conclusively that it was not—it would also be a fair question to ask if anything is lost by trying to demonstrate a "common tenure status."

If there are reasons, they are not obvious; and they were not given. Surely, when one asserts, as Mr. Ham does, that we have done agricultural workers "an extreme disservice" he may be expected to show how—and in considerable detail.

There is ample evidence that the development of property rights in the plant by that group spoken of as "laborers" is not a tactical mistake when programming for their well-being.

Industrial workers, so frequently referred to in this article, have established property rights in their jobs, although the opposite viewpoint was expressed by Mr. Ham. Indeed, much social legislation during the past decade, of which the National Labor Relations Act is a principal part, may be described as the endowment of workers, either as individuals or through their organizations, with substantial rights in property.

The misleading way in which the "sit-down strike" decision was used to indicate the limitations of the workers "only 'right' in the land" is unfortunate. It has been substantially modified by subsequent decisions; for example, the steamship company decision adjudging workers not guilty of an illegal act when continuing to occupy a portion of the ship during a strike; the ruling that a coal company could not exclude from its property striking miners and union representatives; and the decision requiring a lumber company not only to provide transportation for union representatives on its privately owned railroad into its privately owned lumber camps but to grant them freedom of its camps.

There would be little if any progress if those striving for social betterment looked backward and accepted previous decisions as final, conclusive, everlasting.

When Mr. Ham denies that "the factory worker has any control over the conditions of work other than that involved in the right to quit rather than continue" or "has any control over the manner in which the establishment is run"—he is wrong. Does he mean to insist that social reform legislation should not grant to the farm laborer any control over the conditions under which he works, in addition to the right to quit, which he already possesses?

Although the National Labor Relations Act does not compel the employer to come to an agreement with his employees, it does compel him to bargain with them, and when an agreement is reached the employer must be willing to embody the agreement in a written contract. These contracts contain provisions governing the rate of work, the rate at which labor saving machinery may be introduced, and production methods, all of which subtract from the sum total of the property rights of the entrepreneur. The amount subtracted does not vanish into thin air, rather it is only transferred from the management to the workers.

—MARSHALL HARRIS, *Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington*

For Your Attention

TRENDS IN LAND USE IN NORTHERN MICHIGAN: A study of Alpena, Antrim, Ogemaw, and Roscommon Counties. Horace J. Andrews and Willard S. Bromley. Washington, D. C. The Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Foundation. 1941.

In 1939, in Michigan, more than 2,000,000 acres of land reverted to the State because of tax delinquency that extended as far back as 1932. Most of this land lies in the northern part of the State in the four counties named in the title of this pamphlet. In this region, because of the replacement of the original forests of pine and hardwoods by cut-over areas, are found decreased forest productivity, much subsistence farming, widespread speculation, instability of land use, and steadily increasing public ownership.

The study, of which this pamphlet is the result, was undertaken to determine trends in land utilization in these four counties "with the hope that such an analysis would be helpful in directing future use of the land along sounder and more constructive lines than those followed in the past."

Physical, economic, and social changes in the region were investigated.

INSTITUTO INDIGENISTA INTERAMERICANO. BOLETIN INDIGENISTA, v. 1, no. 2. November 1941. Mexico, D. F.

The Boletin Indigenista is published bimonthly as a supplement to the quarterly magazine, America Indigena, to provide current news regarding Indian affairs throughout the Americas. The Spanish contents are translated also into English.

Some 14 pages of this second number of the bulletin are devoted to tributes paid to the memory of Moisés Sáenz, first Ambassador to Peru, whose death occurred on October 24, and who had had much to do with the founding of the institute.

A note on page 15 carries the information that "With the recent ratification of the institute convention by the Congress of Ecuador * * * and its previous ratification by the governments of El Salvador, the United States of America, Honduras, and Mexico, the Inter-American Indian Institute is officially established as an international organization."

A section is devoted to information relating to Indians or to conditions affecting them in the various countries, and a bibliography containing references to works on Indian life in the Americas is included.

NATIONAL DEFENSE MIGRATION. HEARINGS BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE MIGRATION. House of Representatives, seventy-seventh Congress, first session, pursuant to H. Res. 113: A resolution to inquire further into the interstate migration of citizens, emphasizing the present and potential consequences of the migration caused by the National Defense Program. Part 19, Detroit Hearings (Agricultural Section) September 23, 24, 25, 1941. pp. 7767–8014. Washington, D. C.

This second volume of the Detroit hearings "includes the testimony of Prof. E. B. Hill, of the farm-management department of Michigan State College, his prepared statement, and 12 papers from other sources, devoted exclusively to the subject of agricultural migration * * *."

Mr. Hill's statement describes briefly the changes in Michigan agriculture during the last 30 years, types of farming in the State, mechanization of Michigan agriculture, its effect, sizes of farms, part-time and sub-

sistence farming, migratory labor, the defense program and the farm labor situation, and contemplated changes in farm business as a result of the defense program.

In regard to the farm-labor shortage growing out of the defense program, Mr. Hill says:

"As early as July 1940 many farmers began to sense the coming difficulties in the supply of farm labor. The demand for farm labor for the year remained about the same, but the supply began fast to diminish to the extent that the supply became insufficient to meet the demand. This trend has continued, until in July 1941, the latest data available, the ratio of the supply to demand was 50.7 percent of normal. According to Crops and Markets of the United States Department of Agriculture, the situation in Michigan was the worst in the United States * * *."

"Michigan farmers are attempting to carry on and do their part in the food-production program by many different means, some of which are as follows: (1) Increased mechanization of their farms as a means of reducing labor requirements; (2) by working harder and longer hours; (3) more help on the farm by the family; (4) more exchange of work between neighbors; and (5) making more efficient use of hired labor * * *."

Among the 12 exhibits submitted to the committee from various sources not represented by witnesses are: Illegal Transportation of Sugar Beet Workers from Texas to Michigan and Ohio Fields—report by Joseph B. Eastman, Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission; History of Sugar Beet Labor in Michigan—report by Labor Division, Farm Security Administration; Agricultural Migration to Michigan—report by Agricultural Field Staff, Select Committee Investigating National Defense Migration; Migration Problems of Farm Families Due to Defense Activities in Indiana and Ohio—report by P. G Beck, director, Region III, Farm Security Administration.

The Agricultural Industry. DeWitt C. Wing. New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1941. 61 pp.

"'The Agricultural Industry' comprises one of the 40 major industries discussed and analyzed in *The Development of American Industries, Revised Edition,* a book planned and edited by John George Glover and William Bouck Cornell * * *."

This attractively written, compact discussion of the agricultural industry contains a great many "facts and figures." It touches briefly on the early history of agriculture, listing women as the first farmers. It discusses increased mechanization, lists the preludes to organizations of farmers, describes agriculture after the first World War, and lists major farm legislation after 1932. Description is included of the program for range conservation, and the work of the Farm Security Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Food Stamp Plan is set forth.

1941 Supplement to State Forest Tax Law Digest of 1939. Louis S. Murphy. Forest Taxation Inquiry. Washington, D. C., 1941. 8 pp. Processed.

This supplement lists digests of new and amended laws, gives selected provisions of special forest tax laws, and discusses potential and actual application of current forest tax laws.

A Selected Bibliography on the Economics of Forestry in the United States. Alf Z. Nelson. Washington, U. S. Forest Service, Division of Forest Economics, 1941. 172 pp. Processed.

Prepared in response to a long-felt need for a comprehensive bibliography covering the literature relating to the economics of forestry, this compilation is designed also to stimulate interest in the subject.

In addition to general references relating to the subject and references to bibliographies dealing with some phase of forest economics, sections are devoted to references relating to education and research in forest economics, forest communities, the economic importance and scope of public and private forestry, forest regulation, forest resources, ownership of forest lands, transportation, and many others.

We have learned too well that social problems and economic problems are not separate watertight compartments in the international field any more than in the national sphere. In international, as in national affairs, economic policy can no longer be an end unto itself alone. It is merely a means for achieving social objectives.

—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT